

STATE OF IOWA  
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
UTILITIES BOARD

IN RE:  INTERSTATE POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY	DOCKET NO. RPU-02-3
---	---------------------

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

(Issued June 6, 2002)

On May 3, 2002, the Utilities Board (Board) issued in Docket No. RPU-02-3 an "Order Granting Application, Denying Objection, in Part, Requiring Additional Information, and Scheduling Consumer Comment Hearings." Among other things, the order denied a request by the Community Coalition for Rate Fairness (CCRF) that the Board reject, without prejudice, Interstate Power and Light Company's (IPL) electric rate case application and related tariffs filed on March 29, 2002, for failure to comply with the Board's filing requirements. On May 7, 2002, the CCRF filed a motion for reconsideration of the Board's May 3, 2002, order. IPL and the Iowa Consumers Coalition (ICC) each filed a reply on May 21, 2002.

The CCRF in its motion for reconsideration repeats its arguments made in its original request that IPL's rate case filing should be rejected because of IPL's failure to submit a class cost-of-service study in its initial filing and to propose a rate design that reasonably reflects the costs of providing electric service to each class of electric

consumers. The CCRF believed the Board's order denying the CCRF's motion to reject the filing was predicated in large or even determinative part on a finding by the Board that IPL has proposed no changes to rate design in Docket No. RPU-02-3.

The CCRF pointed out that several rate design changes have been proposed, including the shifting of recovery of interruptible bill discounts from base rates to the energy efficiency cost recovery mechanism. Other proposed rate design changes involve new usage criteria for certain farm, general service, and large general service customers.

The Board is not persuaded to depart from the reasoning contained in its May 3, 2002, order. The rate design changes proposed in this proceeding do not appear to be of the types that typically require a class cost-of-service study. The proposed changes are relatively minor and do not focus on rate design and cost allocation issues between the various rate classes that require a class cost-of-service study to decide. In any event, the Board can refuse to make these changes in this docket if the evidence does not support the changes. The motion for reconsideration will be denied

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:**

The motion for reconsideration filed by the Community Coalition for Rate Fairness on May 7, 2002, is denied.

**UTILITIES BOARD**

/s/ Diane Munns

/s/ Mark O. Lambert

ATTEST:

/s/ Sharon Mayer  
Executive Secretary, Assistant to

/s/ Elliott Smith

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 6<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2002.